REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 23, 2009 noted that claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, 17-19 and 22 were pending and rejected all claims. Claim 22 has been canceled and thus, claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13 and 17-19 remain pending.

Double Patenting Rejections

In items 3 and 4 on pages 2-5 of the February 12, 2010 Office Action, claims 1 and 11 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 12 of U. S. Patent No. 7,131,577 to Obara et al. and claims 3 and 12 of U. S. Published Patent Application No. 11/103,450 by Obara et al. (hereinafter Obara '450), both in view of U. S. Patent No. 7,025,255 to Drummond et al. Since Obara '450 has not yet issued as a patent, and since the claims of this application have not yet been indicated as allowable over Drummond et al., it is believed that any submission of a Terminal Disclaimer or arguments as to the non-obvious nature of the claims would be premature (see, MPEP 804.(I)(B)). As such, it is respectfully requested that the Applicants be allowed to address any obviousness-type double patenting issues remaining once the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is resolved and further that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be reconsidered in light of the amended claims presented above.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In item 6 on pages 5-10 of the February 12, 2010 Office Action, claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, 17-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond et al. In addition, the Response to Arguments in item 7 on pages 11-13 addressed the arguments in the Amendment filed November 23, 2009.

As discussed in the November 23, 2009 Amendment, the details of how synchronization is performed in the system disclosed by Drummond et al. are described at column 59, lines 36-52 with reference to Fig. 52. This portion of Drummond et al. states that

> [t]he sync object provides synchronization between tasks. For example, the developer of a terminal director may want to dispense cash and print a receipt at the same time. However, the developer may want to wait for both tasks to complete before continuing. This is accomplished by connecting the operation events of the dispenser object 270 and the printer object 282 to the methods in the sync object. In this case the operation events of the dispenser object 270 and the printer object 282 are connected to sync0 method 542 and sync1 method 544, respectively.

Thus, as noted in the November 23, 2009 Amendment, Drummond et al. describes that the sync object connects the operation events of two I/O agents, i.e., "the dispenser object 270 and the printer object 282 are connected to sync0 method 542 and sync1 method 544, respectively" while claim 1 as previously presented required that

> said browser interprets said screen content from said Web server and performs said guide display, and interprets said script and said applet tag embedded in said screen content and calls up a corresponding method program defined by each processing of said transaction operation, said method program issuing I/O commands to said plurality of I/O controllers for controlling a synchronization of said plurality of I/O units designated by said called method program and receiving a reply from said plurality of I/O units

(last 6 lines of claim 1 in the November 23, 2009 Amendment, emphasis removed).

In response to this distinction, the February 12, 2010 Office Action emphasized the importance of

> the cited portions of Drummond, where defined "terminal directors" implemented within a script would handle operations related to banking transactions via the ATM hardware ports (dispenser, printer, reader etc. of a[n] ATM), such that, dynamically upon encountering embedded such handlers by the interpreting process, the evoked handler code associates a bean, an applet from a reserve/store of such code to realize the request for one of the ATM I/O operations

(Office Action, page 11, lines 11-16). Further, it was asserted that

> The 'method program' is therefore met by the role played by the dynamically invoked beans, applets or Javascript based on the above handlers. Synchronization via message sending and receiving of results has been taught all along the listening functionality of Backstage and Terminal frame in Drummond, such that request (sic) to load, transfer, control, withdraw, inquire (see Fig. 26) are coordinated, hence synchronized activities related to operations implicating ATM terminals or ports are taught

(Office Action, page 12, lines 1-7).

These statements suggest that the Examiner may have misunderstood the distinction that the November 23, 2009 Amendment attempted to elucidate. Applicants do not deny that Drummond et al. describes "[s]ynchronization via message sending and receiving of results" but rather that the way that such synchronization occurs in Drummond et al. is different from that of the claimed invention. If the "method programs" recited in claims 1 and 11 are interpreted as equivalent to "the dynamically invoked beans, applets or Javascript" (Office Action, page 12, lines 2-3), the program code in Drummond et al. that performs functionality allegedly equivalent to the "method programs" is at a much higher level than that in the claimed invention and there are multiple layers of software between "the dynamically invoked beans," etc., and the "plurality of I/O units" (e.g., claim 1, line 5). This is to be expected given that one of the objects of

Drummond et al. is "to provide an automated banking machine and system that provides a user with a familiar interface and transaction options of their home institution at machines operated by foreign institutions" (column 3, lines 33-36). It is well known in the software development art to provide a consistent user interface by separating the operations selected by a user from operations performed by hardware through an interface that translates user commands into instructions for hardware.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, is directed to a system and method that among other features provides faster processing of an ATM transaction by tying "each processing of said transaction operation" (e.g., claim 1, lines 17-18) closely to "a plurality of I/O controllers, each I/O controller controlling a corresponding one of said I/O units" (e.g., claim 1, lines 10-11) and "issuing I/O commands to said plurality of I/O controllers" (e.g., claim 1, lines 18-19) in quick succession, for example, as illustrated in Fig 12 and described in the paragraph beginning at page 24, line 7, of the application. Specifically, claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the browser "calls up one of said method programs in correspondence to each processing of said transaction operation, each called method program issuing I/O commands to said plurality of I/O controllers" (claim 1, lines 16-19, and claim 11, lines 21-24). Since the method programs issue the I/O commands, there are no layers of software between the method programs and the I/O controllers.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 1 and 11, as well as claims 3, 7-9, 13 and 17-19 which depend therefrom, patentably distinguish over Drummond et al. for at least the reasons discussed above.

Summary

It is submitted that Drummond et al. does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13 and 17-19 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 12, 2010

By: /Richard A. Gollhofer/
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501